

Application No. 10/786,777
Attorney Docket No. 213187-00008

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 27 2006

REMARKS

Upon entry of the Amendment, Claims 1-5 and 11 and 12 are pending. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to more particularly point out the invention. In as much as the Office Action is under final, a Request for Continuing Examination under 37 CFR § 1.114 is included herewith. It is respectfully submitted that upon entry of the amendment and consideration of the remarks below that the application is in condition for allowance.

CLAIM -OBJECTIONS

Claim 11 has been objected to as failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 11 is dependent upon Claim 1. As amended, Claim 11 recites an element not present in Claim 1; namely a video playback application. Claim 1 merely defines the linked video files in terms of playback. For these reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this objection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,198,833 ("the Rangan et al patent") in view of Feinleib US Patent No. 6,637,032 ("the Feinleib patent"). It is respectfully submitted that neither the Rangan, et al. patent nor Feinleib patent disclose or suggest the invention recited in amended claim 1. In particular, the Applicant agrees with the Examiner's assessment that the Rangan et al patent "fails to explicitly teach said video linking system generating one or more linked video files separate from said video content, being configured to identify the pixel objects by frame number and location within the frame." Office Action, mailed on October 30, 2006, page 4, lines 19-21. The Applicant further agrees that "Rangan does not explicitly teach information not embedded in video content." Office Action, mailed on October 30, 2006, page 5, lines 14-15. The Applicant also agrees that the Feinleib patent teaches embedding closed captioning script in the Vertical Blanking Interval of a video signal. The Examiner states on Page 5 that "VBI is not part of the video data and thus, Feineib shows information such as captioning script can be stored in VBI

Page 4 of 7

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application No. 10/786,777
Attorney Docker No. 213187-00008

(vertical blanking interval) and thus not embedded in video content.” The Applicant respectfully disagrees with such a characterization.

More particularly, it is respectfully submitted (and I am sure the Examiner will agree) that the VBI is part of a standard composite video signal, as generally described in Col. 3, lines 45-59 of the Feinlieb patent. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the VBI and the “video image data” (as the term is used in the Feinlieb patent) are part of single composite video signal. In other words, it is respectfully submitted that the VBI and the “video image data” are not sent as separate signals. Moreover, it is also clear that any information contained in the VBI is embedded therein is already embedded when the signal is broadcast from the broadcast station or cable head end. More specifically, in the embodiment disclosed in the Feinlieb patent, the information is closed captioning script which may be selectively decoded by the television receiver or clients 22(1) ...22(M) as illustrated in Fig. 1. Thus it should be clear that the “video image signal” and the VBI are broadcast together as part of a standard TV signal.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that the closed captioning script is clearly embedded if not a part of the video content transmitted by the video content provider. As such the Feinlieb patent clearly does not disclose “linked video files” which are separate from and not embedded in the video content for several reasons. First, if the client, i.e. devices 22(1)... 22(M), illustrated in Fig. 1 of the Feinlieb patent, activates its close captioning feature, all of the close captioning scripts will be displayed and thus become part of the video image (“The Television Decoding Circuitry Act of 1990 requires that all televisions made after 1993 of a size 13 inches or larger be equipped with closed captioning decoding circuitry.”, the Feinlieb patent, Col. 3, line 66- Col. 4, line 2). Second, as mentioned above, information or data embedded in the VBI is “not separate from the video content as the term is used in the claims. As recited in the claims and defined in the specification, the linked video files are “created separately from the original content” Paragraph [0035] of the instant application. It is also pointed out that adding any type of information to a broadcast video signal even in the VBI requires an alteration of the video signal.

Application No. 10/786,777

Attorney Docket No. 213187-00008

albeit adding information to the VBI. Such alterations of broadcast video signals by third parties are not generally permitted by the video content owners. The present invention solves this problem by providing "linked video files" which does not require alteration in any way of the video content, i.e. broadcast video signal. As such, it is respectfully submitted that both the Rangan et al and Feinlieb patents teach away from an image processing system which generates linked video files which are separate and not embedded in the video content. Thirdly, the term "video content" as the term is used in the claims is defined by several examples which include "an on-demand source", such as the output from a DVD player as well as streaming video from video content producer. The Examiner's attention is directed to paragraph [0031] of the instant application. Both of these examples clearly relate to a composite video signal which includes the "video image information" + the VBI. It is respectfully submitted that the "linked video files" are separate from such video content. For all of the above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rangan, et al. patent and the Feinlieb patent further in view of the Vidovic, U.S. Patent No. 3,878,557. Claims 2 and 3 are dependent upon claim 1. The Rangan, et al. and Feinlieb patents have already been discussed. The Vidovic patent was cited for teaching a videotape recording apparatus which shows color frame pulses separated by 66 millihertz. The Vidovic patent otherwise does not disclose or suggest a video linking system, as recited in the claims, which generates video linking files which are separate from the video content as recited in the claims at issue. For these reasons and the above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2 and 3.

Claims 4 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Rangan, et al. patent and the Feinlieb patent in view of Toklu, U.S. Patent No. 6,549,643. Claims 4 and 5 are also dependent upon claim 1. The Rangan, et al. and Feinlieb patents have been discussed above. The Toklu patent was cited for teaching video summarization methods,

Application No. 10/786,777
Attorney Docket No. 213187-00008

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 27 2006

but does not otherwise disclose a video linking system which generates linked video files that are separate from the video content wherein the linked video files identify the frame and location within the frame of selectable pixel objects within each frame. For these reasons and the above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 4 and 5.

Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unparentable over the Rangan, et al. patent and the Feinlieb patent in view of Hunke U.S. Patent No. 5,912,980 ("the Hunke patent"). Claim 12 is dependent upon claim 1. The Rangan, et al. and Feinlieb patents have been discussed above. The Hunke patent was cited for teaching an image processing system that compensates for lighting changes. It does not otherwise disclose a video linking system, as recited in the claims, which generates linked video files that are separate from the video content wherein the linked video files identify the frame and location within the frame of selectable pixel objects within each frame. For these reasons and the above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 12.

Respectfully submitted,

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP

By:


John S. Panlaguas

Registration No. 31,051

Attorney for Applicant(s)

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP
525 W. Monroe Street
Chicago, Illinois 60661-3693
Telephone: (312) 902-5200
Facsimile: (312) 902-1061

Page 7 of 7

BEST AVAILABLE COPY